

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 14-20, and 22 will remain pending in this application. Claim 7 is cancelled in this paper. Claims 5, 11-13, and 21 were previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter added to claims 1, 14, 17, and 22 is supported at least at page 11, lines 4-6, of the instant Specification.

Claims 6 and 7 stand objected to as depending from a cancelled claim, namely, claim 5. Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,349,296 (“Broder et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,410 (“Sharangpani”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,423 (“Pugh et al.”). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Broder et al. in view of Sharangpani and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,788 (“Powell et al.”) and Pugh et al. Claims 14-16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Broder et al. in view of Powell et al. and further in view of Pugh et al.

Interview Summary

Applicant’s undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Brent Stace participated in a telephonic interview on April 10, 2008 to discuss the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Stace agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 7 stand objected to as depending from a cancelled claim, namely, claim 5. Applicant has amended claim 6 to depend from claim 1 and has cancelled claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Broder et al. in view of Sharangpani and further in view of Pugh et al. As per claim 1, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Broder et al. discloses a method for detecting similar objects in a collection of such objects, comprising, for each of two objects, modifying a previous method for detecting similar objects. Broder et al. is cited as teaching all of the limitations of claim 1, except for the limitations “...so that memory requirements are reduced while avoiding false detections approximately as well as in the previous method,” “compressing . . . wherein the number of bits of precision is reduced from a number of bits of precision used in the previous method,” and “wherein the number of matching supersamples is greater than a number of matching supersamples required in the previous method.” Sharangpani and Pugh et al. are cited as disclosing these limitations.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1, as amended, recites the limitations “processing a query to produce the collection of objects” and “constructing a plurality of hash tables for the collection of objects produced by processing the query.” As stated at page 11, lines 4-6, constructing the hash tables for the set of returned documents to a query makes further reduction in bit precision possible, so that only six values are needed for the full set of documents rather than fifteen. As a result, memory requirements may be reduced. By contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that Broder et al. does not disclose constructing hash tables for the set of returned documents to a query. Further, Applicant submits that neither Sharangpani nor Pugh et al. discloses constructing hash tables for the set of returned documents to a query.

For at least these reasons and the reasons discussed in previous papers, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Broder et al., Sharangpani, nor Pugh et al., considered individually or in combination, discloses all of the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Broder et al. in view of Sharangpani and further in view of Pugh et al. Claims 2-4 and 8-10 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Broder et al. in view of Sharangpani and further in view of Pugh et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Broder et al. in view of Sharangpani and further in view of Powell et al. and Pugh et al. The rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Powell et al. discloses compressing

each supersample to 16 bits of precision. However, claim 6 depends from claim 1 and incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1. Applicant submits that Powell et al. does not disclose the limitation of “constructing a plurality of hash tables for the collection of objects produced by processing the query” and that, therefore, claim 6 is patentable over Broder et al. in view of Sharangpani and further in view of Powell et al. and Pugh et al. at least by reason of its dependency from claim 1.

Claims 14-16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Broder et al. in view of Powell et al. and further in view of Pugh et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 14 and 22, as amended, recite similar limitations as those discussed above in connection with claim 1. In particular, claims 14 and 22, as amended, recite the limitation of “constructing a plurality of hash tables for the items in the search engine query result.” As discussed above in connection with claim 1, this limitation is not disclosed in Broder et al., Powell et al., or Pugh et al. For at least this reason and the reasons set forth in previous papers, claims 14 and 22 are patentable over Broder et al. in view of Powell et al. and further in view of Pugh et al. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14 and are patentable at least by reason of this dependency.

Based at least on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record and requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-5031/307238.01
Application No.: 10/805,805
Office Action Dated: January 15, 2008

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: April 15, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439